

ITAC Court Core Data Transfer Project Update

CCDT

08-30-04

(The purpose of this document is to collect input for the ITAC)

▪ **Project Name**

Superior Court Core Data Transfer Working Group, CCDT.

▪ **Executive Summary**

To utilize a Working Group of JUSTIS members, users and designers of analytic processes to complete a detailed requirements analysis, and document that analysis allowing the effort to benefit the courts and their IJIS design and implementation, allowing the data contribution authorized by the courts for dissemination via JUSTIS to satisfy user requirements, and allowing the design and implementation of a court core data transfer process to benefit the entire JUSTIS community.

▪ **Major Activities Completed This Reporting Period**

1. Met with CCDT Working Group.
2. Updated & circulated initial membership/attendance list – again
3. ITLO announced that while all participants are expected to represent their agency, one work product per agency may be turned in.
4. The Court Data Item list was updated for missing items & on placed on the virtual office
5. An Automated Document Requirements Chart and a set of Directions were completed and placed on the virtual office.
6. An aggregate list of Court Data Items was updated and placed on the virtual office
7. An aggregate Automated Document Requirements Chart was updated and placed on the virtual office.

▪ **Major Activities Planned for Next Reporting Period**

Contractor: N/A

This project will not utilize ITAC contractors

Subcontractors: N/A

This project will not utilize ITAC sub-contractors

Project Management:

1. Remind participants **there is no 09/06/04 work session.**
2. Continue to update, correct and add to membership list
3. The Court Data Items list is to be completed by 09/06/04.
4. An aggregate Agency Court Data Items Requirements List is to be completed by 09/06/04.
5. An aggregate Automated Document Requirements Chart is to be completed by 09/06/04.
6. An Agency Description of Court Output Displays is to be completed by 09/06/04
7. Prepare and post a copy of the Meeting Notes from 08/30/04 CCDT Working Group.
8. Request **final** soft copies of all agency work products to be turned in by 09/03/04.
9. Prepared the DRAFT Final Report of the Court Core Data Transfer Working Group.
10. Prepare for the next CCDT meeting on 09/13/04.

Project Working Group:**Agencies:**

- 1) **Please** send final soft copies of all work products, either WORD or EXCEL to the moderator at earl.gillespie@dc.gov
- 2) **Please review and complete your final 08/30/04 list of Court Data Items.**
- 3) Please complete your final report/description of the agency view(s), opinions and/or presentations of how the new DCSC response to a query should be designed.
- 4) Please complete your final report of the automated documents and their transmission paths requirements chart.
- 5) Remember there is no 09/06/04 Work Session.

Courts:

- 6) The courts will finalize #2, but in "reverse", that is, their data requirements list will reflect court data requirements from agencies.
- 7) The courts will finalize #3, but in "reverse", that is, their query response will reflect court concepts and/or experiences from earlier phases of this project.
- 8) The courts will finalize #4, but in "reverse", that is, their automated documents and document flows requirements will reflect court document requirements from other agencies.

- **Project Schedule**

This project will make every effort to conclude by 09/30/04
 The project in its _1st_ week on the date of this report.

The project is / is not on schedule. If not, why not, how long.

- **06/24/04** – Agreement to Proceed with CCDT Working Group Activities
- **07/06/04** - Agency / Participants Identified
- **07/06/04** - Bi-weekly work Sessions Scheduled
- **07/06/04** – First work Session – Review, Discussion and Modification of Deliverables & Work Schedule
- **07/22/04** - Review and Modification of Presentation for ITAC – Permission to Proceed
- **07/26/04** – No meeting
- **08/02/04** - Court Presentation of Detailed IJIS Criminal Objectives and Schedule
- **08/09/04** – Court Presentation of Criminal Data Dictionary, Data Sharing Standards, Policies and Practices
- **08/16/04** - Individual Descriptions of Agency Court Data Utilization and Court's Agency Data Utilization
- ~~08/23/04 - Individual Agency Court Data Requirements and Court's Agency Data Requirements~~ Individual Agency Data Delivery Requirements
- ~~08/30/04 - Individual Agency Data Delivery Requirements~~ **Individual Agency Data Delivery Requirements AND Data / Record Layout Requirements & Screen / Document Requirements**
- **09/06/04** – No work Session - Holiday
- ~~09/13/04 – Data / Record Layout Requirements & Screen / Document Requirements~~ **Final Draft Closing Review, Prepare Presentation**
- ~~09/20/04 - Final Draft & Closing Review, Prepare Presentation~~ **Extra Work Session – if**

Required

- 09/23/04 -Comprehensive Data Requirements Document, Prioritized Delivery Requirements Presented as Final Report to ITAC

- **Project Cost**

Total baseline budget – N/A

Revised budgets and justification/authorization for revisions - N/A

Budget Spreadsheet- N/A

No Budget – each agency is participating using existing resources.

- **Issues of Concern**

Open Issues of Concern

1. MPD - Is there a final disposition field? We couldn't find one and are wondering how we would know which disposition should be considered final.
2. MPD - Why are no charge count fields included on this list? Our Records Manager noted the count may be a way of determining what charge to match to our original arrest charge, because the court can take one arrest charge and create several counts.
3. There are several charge codes. Which one does the court populate with their charge code, because their charge code is different from the MPD "original" arrest code?
4. DCDC - In particular, DOC requires a data element which clearly, redundantly and unambiguously by charge/count indicates whether the charge/count is a Felony or Misdemeanor.
5. DCDC - It is a huge inefficiency in the system because this information must often be verified by phone and unnecessarily increases the cost of processing. It also increases the risk of processing other documents incorrectly because of time pressures.
6. DCDC - The court needs to start collecting this information for every charge, and record it to their database.

Closed Issues of Concern

1. Resolution: The ITAC has given the CCDT Working Group permission to proceed. **The ITAC will be required to approve the project and give permission to proceed**
2. Resolution: The Court Project Manager recognized this deficiency and will provide leadership on these subjects during the course of the project. **The ITLO did not anticipate use of document/file transfers; the courts will need to identify the most appropriate opportunities for document creation and transfer**
3. Resolution: The DCSC CIO has discussed the issue with his project team and vendors. The court expects to be using GJJXDM by December. **The use of the Global Justice XML Data Model 3.0 is considered mandatory by ITAC agencies for all future efforts. It is an important portion of JUSTIS Phase 4. The IJIS project utilizes Legal XML. The two are not compatible nor are the “translatable.”**
4. Resolution: All agencies have been notified of the activity and invited to participate. The project schedule will not allow a “hold” while other agencies make a determination to participate. “The train has left the station.” The US Marshal Service visited the ITLO and Security Officer and has been invited to join the effort. **Although the number of individuals representing different portions of member agencies is participating, not all agencies are represented. Missing, in particular, are users such as the State Department and FBI, and partners from HIDTA and CapWIN.**

8. Resolution: The court does not record the arrest charges on the court system. In addition, the charges reported “back” to the MPD, and all agencies, reflect the charges files in court for trial. The MPD reported data quality issues that must be examined in detail prior to conversion of court data:
 - a. There must be an examination to determine if arrest data submitted automatically to the courts properly overwrite/updates court files
 - b. There must be an examination of court data on CJIS where more than ten (10) charges are sent from the court. Charges in excess of 10 may inadvertently be written to the next arrest record.
 - c. If charges are inadvertently written to an incorrect record, errors will be found in the disposition fields.

- **Related Projects**

1. JUSTIS Phase Four
2. SHIELD Implementation
3. CapWIN & HIDTA interfaces